scheme purely on theoretical grounds. They questioned the justification on the part of Government in collecting Rs. 75 lakhs every year from an immoral source from indigent people like Adi-Dravidas and Lambanis, especially as the amount was being spent for the benefit of higher communities. They added that if the scheme was made a success, Government were sure to effect large savings under spending departments like Medical, Police and Law Courts.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL repeated the statement already made by him, *viz.*, that there was no objection to try the experiment in the Channarayapatna Taluk and watch the results.

At this stage, the Assembly rose for lunch and re-assembled at 3.45 p.m.

REPRESENTATIONS—*Contd.*

No. 33.—Recovery of Income-tax in four instalments.

Mr. Shampur Papanna, Special Interest, Bangalore City.

MR. SHAMPUR PAPANNA represented that as no good trade could be done in this country unless articles were sold on credit, the profits which the merchants were supposed to have derived would not generally have been received in time to pay the income-tax. Moreover, many did not know how to maintain accounts in the manner in which the Government wanted them to be maintained and in such cases the tax levied on the turn-over basis was likely to be excessive. For these reasons, he prayed that income-tax might be recovered in four instalments.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL observed that the tax to be paid was on the income of the preceding year and the recovery in two instalments was itself a concession and its further extension was not possible.

MESSRS. LINGE GOWDA and D. S. MALLAPPA suggested that as in the case of land revenue, income-tax also might be recovered in four instalments.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL observed that the analogy of land revenue was not applicable and that the case of income-tax was different as it was in respect of the income of the previous year.

MR. PAPANNA requested that this concession of collecting the income-tax in four instalments might be allowed at least to those who paid an income-tax of Rs. 1,000 and above.

MR. SUBBARAMA CHETTY said that there were many penalties prescribed for failure to pay income-tax in two instalments. He requested that in case the Government could not allow the income-tax to be collected in four instalments, at least the penalties might be removed.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL observed that it was necessary to enforce the provisions intended to make timely collections.

No. 34.—Recovery of one rupee fee by the Sub-Registrar at the time of registering every mortgage deed for registering the name of the Executee in the Special Notice Register of the Taluk Office.

Messrs. H. Basavayya, Minority Interest; and Halkur Rudrappa, Arsikere Taluk.

MR. BASAVAYYA represented that the Sub-Registrars might be directed to recover a fee of one rupee in addition to the registration fee on every mortgage document presented for registration and send the fee to the Taluk Office for registering the name of the Executee in the Special Notice Register. He added that the mortgagee would not have registered his name in the Special Notice Register and that if he died, his heirs would not know anything about the mortgage. The difficulty would be that if the land came up for sale later, it would go without the mortgagee knowing anything about it.

MR. MIRLE LAKSHMINARANAPPA said that in the Land Revenue Rules, there was at present option to the parties to register their names in the Special Notice Register. The representation was that it should be made compulsory.

MESSRS. GURUMURTHIACHARYA, NAGAPPA SETTY and B. LINGE GOWDA supported the representation.

THE INSPECTOR-GENERNL OF REGISTRATION said that if the proposal was accepted, the Sub-Registry Office would become a mere post office and that there would be delay in the transmission of these documents to the Taluk Office. He also thought that extra establishment would be necessary to discharge this additional work. To avoid all this, he suggested that it would be better for the parties to go to the Taluk Office direct and get their names registered in the Special Register by paying the prescribed fee.

MR. H. C. DASAPPA said that even though there was provision in the Land Revenue Code for the people getting their names registered in the Register, it was only optional and not more than 15 to 20 per cent of the people were taking advantage of the provision. He thought that it was

very necessary to make it compulsory and incumbent on every Executee to get his name registered in the Special Notice Register and requested the Government to accept the proposal as it would not only safeguard the interests of the people but would also bring in more revenue to Government.

MESSRS. S. C. MALLAIYA and BANUMIAH said that it would be a great hardship to the poor raiyats if the payment was made compulsory. They thought that it might be optional as at present.

MR. BELUR SRINIVASIYENGAR said that it was difficult to enforce the payment of an additional one rupee while registering the documents.

MR. CHENNABASAPPA said that if at the time of preparing a correct Record of Rights it was insisted that the documents should be presented for registry in the Special Notice Register, that was sufficient and that there would be no necessity for a separate provision as was suggested.

THE THIRD MEMBER OF COUNCIL observed that it would not be necessary if the Record of Rights was introduced in the whole State. In the meantime, he promised that the question would be examined.

No. 35. —Inspection of Muzrai Institutions.

Messrs. L. Vema Reddy and Venkataswami Gowda.

MR. L. VEMA REDDY represented that as muzrai temples all over the State were deteriorating for want of proper inspection, it should be made compulsory that these institutions should be inspected at least once a year by the inspecting officers and the results of their inspections reported. He added that in many instances, the income from the *inam* lands attached to the temples was not spent on the up-keep of the temples but enriched the pockets of the archaks; that the temples were neglected and in respect of some temples, there were none to look after them. He requested that the Government should provide some funds for the up-keep of these time-honoured religious institutions.

He also instanced the case of the temple on the Markandeya Betta in the Kolar Taluk. He said that it was a big temple which was going to ruin and nobody had so far inspected it.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that if particular cases of temples were brought to notice it would be possible to make enquiries and see what could be done. He added that many temples had no funds or property and

that it was not possible to provide funds for the improvement of all temples, but as far as finances permitted, Government were allotting funds for the improvement of important temples.

In regard to inspections, he said, that there were standing orders for inspections of institutions by different officers.

MR. VEMA REDDY brought to the notice of the House that the moneys of certain temples had been spent on others and that in respect of the Tirupati Temple in the Malur Taluk, the Comptroller had passed an order that with the exception of a small amount, the entire amount should be handed over to Government.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that the funds of one temple would not ordinarily be spent on another and that if any cases of diversion of funds were brought to notice, necessary enquiries would be made.

Mr. B. LINGE GOWDA of Closepet said that the Revenasiddeswara temple in Closepet was in a very dilapidated condition and that the estimate was said to be under preparation for the past three years without anything being done to the temple at all.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that the Muzrai Commissioner would look into the matter.

MR. SIDDALINGAPPA SETTY represented that although he brought the case of the Palarswami temple at Chikmagalur, which was in a state of disrepair to the notice of the authorities several times, no action had been taken by the Muzrai Department so far towards repairing it.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that necessary enquiries would be made.

MR. VENKATASWAMI GOWDA of Malur represented that the temples in the villages were in a very bad condition with no one to manage them and look after their repairs and that there were none to check the archaks of those temples who appropriated all the income from the lands attached to such temples for their personal use.

THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER said that four auditors had been recently appointed to prepare an up-to-date list of the properties of these institutions and all the irregularities would be set right in the near future.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that there was a proposal to make over the minor muzrai temples in the villages to the Village Panchayets concerned as the Amildars could not do anything for them.

MR. VENKATASWAMI GOWDA requested that till that period, the Amildars should be instructed to inspect these institutions.

MR. M. S. LINGE GOWDA enquired whether the Government would be prepared to hand over any of these temples to private bodies if they came forward to maintain them.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that the Government would consider such proposals.

MR. N. G. SANJEEVIAH was opposed to this suggestion.

MR. D. S. MALLAPPA said that muzrai institutions were not being properly looked after by the Department. He said that in the Yediyur Temple, the Brahmin Parpatyegar was being continued in spite of the protests of the people and of the Dharmadarsis. He added that the action of Government in appointing an Assistant Parpatyegar there belonging to the Lingayet Community only increased the cost of establishment. He urged that as there was no need for two people in the temple and as the temple was a Lingayet institution, the Brahmin Parpatyegar might be removed.

THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER replied that he had seen the records relating to the Brahmin Parpatyegar; that it was not right to remove a person who was serving in the institution from a pretty long time by a mere executive order of Government; that there were no bad reports against the person and that with a view to give facilities to the Lingayet devotees who went to that institution, a Lingayet Parpatyegar had been appointed. He added that even all the Dharmadarsis did not want the removal of the Brahmin Parpatyegar.

THE DEWAN observed that it was not a purely Lingayet institution and that it would be difficult to drive away a man from it on account simply of his caste. He appeared to be doing his work satisfactorily for the past 30 years, and had collected funds for the institution and it seemed hardly fair to remove him. After him, surely, some Lingayet would be appointed as Parpatyegar.

MR. D. S. MALLAPPA said that there were any number of complaints against the person, that the Dharmadarsis had passed resolutions against him and that therefore he might be transferred to some other Brahmin institution.

THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER said that the charges brought against the Parpatyegar were examined by the then Deputy Commissioner and he reported that the irregularities enumerated against him were not proved. After that, on the representations of the Lingayets, another Lingayet

Assistant Parpatyegar had been appointed. He said that he had examined all the records and he was convinced that the Parpatyegar could not be removed. He did not doubt that there was a bitter feeling against him. But the man had a right to the appointment and if he was removed, there would be very serious consequences. He was appointed in a Government Order about 30 years back.

MR. B. S. PUTTASWAMI enquired why the person should not be removed when there was a general feeling against him.

THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER replied that simply because the feeling against him was strong, he could not be illegally removed. Some people opposed him simply because he was a Brahmin and for nothing else.

MR. B. S. PUTTASWAMY again said that the temple was a Lingayet Gaddige and did not belong to the Brahmins. The Parpatyegar could not even go inside the temple. In these circumstances, he did not know why he should be continued there. He suggested that he might be transferred to any other temple even with promotion.

MR. H. C. DASAPPA in supporting the views expressed by Mr. Puttaswami said that in times of *Samaradhanas* and other functions, only one particular community was getting all the benefits at the cost of other communities as a result of this Parpatyegar being in charge of the institution. He did not see why this should be done when the disciples of the temple were all Lingayets.

THE DEWAN observed that orders had been recently issued to the effect that the *Samaradhana* should be open to the members of all Hindu communities.

MR. DASAPPA continuing said that the income of the temple was derived from the other communities and the advantage of all that went only to one community. He thought that the work would be better conducted if a Parpatyegar of the Lingayet community was appointed in place of the Brahmin Parpatyegar. When *Samaradhana* was thrown open to all, he did not see any great difficulty in passing a similar order removing the present Brahmin Parpatyegar, transferring him elsewhere.

MR. KHANDAPPA was of the view that in a Lingayet institution, Brahmins should not be fed.

MR. S. C. MALLAIYA enquired how many devotees of the Brahmin community there were in that temple. If they all belonged to the Lingayet community, there was no reason, in his opinion, why a Brahmin Parpatyegar should be in that temple.

MR. N. G. SANJEEVIAH did not agree to any temple being earmarked for a particular community. He was of opinion that it would be better if the temple was made available to all the communities. He was against the principle of entrusting the control of any temple to any one community. He understood that the Yediyur temple had also Kurubar devotees and as such he did not like any predominance of the Lingayet community so far as that temple was concerned.

Adjournment Motion.

At 4.45 p.m. Mr. G. Channappa was permitted to move the following adjournment motion:—

"That the business of the House be adjourned to discuss an urgent matter of public importance and of recent occurrence, *viz.*, the policy underlying the recent G.O. imposing the punitive police at a cost of Rs. 14,000 per annum on the people of Davangere."

In moving this adjournment motion, MR. CHANNAPPA said that the members of the House were aware of the disturbances that took place at Davangere during the last Moharrum and that he was sure that every one of them felt sorry for what happened there. Although it was not his object to argue who were responsible for the disturbances, he would not be far wrong in saying that the inaction on the part of the officers on the spot was to some extent responsible for allowing the disturbance to assume such huge proportions.

At the request of the people of Davangere, the Dewan was kind enough to visit that place and arrange for a compromise meeting. For this, the people of Davangere could not be too grateful to him. He studied the actual situation at Davangere, formulated a relief committee and sowed the seeds of harmonious relationship between the two communities. If the local officers had taken one-hundredth part of the interest evinced by the Dewan, the question of a punitive tax could not have come up at all.

MR. CHANNAPPA said that the most important point to be considered was whether there was any need for the levy of punitive tax at Davangere. He said that not one of the three conditions mentioned in the Police Regulation, which were necessary for the imposition of this punitive tax, was satisfied in the case under consideration:—

(1) First, the Regulation required that there should

be disturbed conditions. He said that there was absolutely no disturbance since the last visit of the Dewan Sahib to that place

(2) The second condition was that there should be a dangerous situation. He thought that nobody could say that there was any dangerous situation at Davangere. For instance, the last Ganapathi Festival went off without any untoward event. The Hindus and the Muhammadans at the place were getting on very cordially.

(3) The third condition was the conduct of the people. In this matter also, he said that in Davangere, people were helping the Government in all manner of ways in maintaining peace. He did not also think that there was any suspicious conduct among the people in Davangere.

Even when all these three conditions were not fulfilled, it was a wonder to him why the punitive police force was stationed there, and the people asked to pay a tax therefor. He did not think that such a tax was levied anywhere else where greater disturbances occurred. He therefore failed to see why such a tax should have been imposed only at Davangere now, even though the last disturbances took place more than four months back. He also failed to understand who suggested the imposition of such a punitive tax. He did not know whether the District Magistrate or the Inspector-General of Police recommended it. If they had done so, he said he would like to know the actual facts on which they proceeded to suggest such a drastic action. He was not also sure that the people wanted such a tax for the simple reason that it would bring a lot of trouble upon themselves.

Continuing Mr. Channappa said that Davangere was the third important city in the State and a big commercial centre. When the Dewan had come to that place twice, he had promised to convert it into a model city. When the people had such bright hopes about the future of their town, punitive tax was imposed on them and that had adversely affected their prestige and trade. Foreign concerns hesitated to transact business with them as a result of this action of Government which gave the outside world to understand that the people of Davangere were a set of rowdies. By imposing this punitive tax, the Government had created ill-feeling rather than brought about amity and concord in the town.

In conclusion, Mr. Channappa said that as there were no disturbances at Davangere since the 19th of June 1929 and

as the people were as anxious as the Government to maintain the peace of the place and bring about harmonious feelings between the various communities, there was no necessity to maintain the punitive force and impose a levy on the people of Davangere for maintaining it.

With these remarks, he appealed to the Government to abolish the punitive tax forthwith and remove the slur cast on the people of Davangere.

MR. SATYANARAYANA CHETTY in seconding the motion said that in reply to a question regarding the Davangere Disturbances, the Government said that the matter was *sub-judice* and could not be discussed. If that was the case, he failed to understand how the Government could impose a punitive tax and maintain a punitive force at Davangere and prejudge the decision of the cases now pending in the Courts. It was just possible that it would be found that the local officers were responsible. Without finding out who were responsible for the disturbances, he thought it was not proper for Government to levy the punitive tax. He also added that that was the first instance in the Mysore State where the punitive tax was levied.

Continuing he said that Davangere was a very important commercial centre in the State and trade in that place would suffer very much as the outsiders would hesitate to transact business there.

For these reasons, he requested the Government to abolish the tax imposed on the people of Davangere.

MR. HOSAKOPPA KRISHNA RAO said that it was a matter for regret that there had been some disturbances of peace in certain parts of the State during the past year or more, on account of the acts of rowdies. The common opinion, he said, in regard to the disturbances at Davangere, was that they were due to the tactlessness of the officers and the acts of the rowdies. If, on the other hand, the Government were satisfied that the disturbance was due to the people of Davangere generally, then there was a justification for the punitive tax. But the prime duty of the Government was to trace the culprits whether they be rowdies or Government officers. In the case under consideration, he was satisfied that the Government did nothing of the kind. He did not know whether as a matter of fact, the Government investigated into the matter. It was however complained to him that the local officers did not carry out their duties properly with the result that the disturbances were caused. If the Government said that the matter had been thoroughly

investigated departmentally, that was another matter, but such a report had not been published. The Government should have satisfied themselves about the real facts before levying the tax and should not have taken action merely on one-sided reports of the officers. The Government had a responsible duty to satisfy the local people. If they failed in that duty, he thought that the opinion against Mysore would be broadcasted and a sort of slur would be cast on the people themselves. He was in a position to say that the people of Davangere were not in any way responsible for the disturbances there.

He thought that if the punitive tax was continued for any length of time, it would pave the way for levying a similar tax everywhere else even when the least disturbance took place, and it would lead to a general dissatisfaction, among the people.

Mr. Krishna Rao observed that the people and the Government should co-operate in the maintenance of public peace. It was just possible that some people of one community might incite their men and bring about disturbances and dissensions. But it could not be stated that the whole population was responsible for it.

Referring to Section 24 (1) of the Police Regulation, Mr. Krishna Rao said that the Deputy Commissioner had the discretion to impose such a tax. He thought that if the local officers were given such a discretion, it would inevitably lead to more disturbances rather than the pacification of the people. When the local officers themselves were suspected in this case, he said it was not right that such power should be given to them. He was of opinion that such a punitive tax was opposed to the best interests and the honour of thecountry.

Continuing Mr. Krishna Rao said that he was not aware what action Government had taken against their own officers for their alleged mistakes while they very readily took action and punished the people who were not at all responsible for the disturbances. There was no independent enquiry of any sort.

For these reasons, he recommended that the tax should be removed forthwith.

MR. CHENNABASAPPA said that at a time when the people had begun to live in amity and concord, it was not right to impose this penal tax on the law abiding people of Davangere which was the Manchester of Mysore and lower the people there in the estimation of the outside public. He added that the slur should be removed as soon as possible.

MR. M. S. LINGE GOWDA observed that it would not be right to say that the disturbance at Davangere was due to Hindu-Muslim conflict, nor to the local officers failing in the discharge of their duty. Such troubles had been taking place in the State since the last two years and on every occasion, the Hindus had rescued from danger the Muhammadans and *vice versa* and that was proof positive that the riots were not due to Hindu-Muslim differences. He was firmly of opinion that they were due to an organised campaign on the part of some people who wanted to bring the present Dewan into disrepute and carried on a nefarious propaganda both in and outside the State to achieve their object. Such people must be deported from the State and no other kind of punishment would meet the requirements of the case. If that was done, he thought, that things would improve in the State.

MR. LINGE GOWDA failed to understand why the people of Davangere did not co-operate with the Government in surrendering the budmashes. The moment that was done, he thought that the Government should remove punitive police.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL observed that it was not right to say that the Government imposed punitive tax on the people of Davangere and that there was no such term as "Punitive Police" in the Police Regulation. He added that in the Regulation there was provision for maintaining an additional police force in any place where the Government considered it necessary in the interests of peace and public safety and to collect the amount required for the maintenance of the force from the people and under that provision the force was being maintained in the interests of the safety of the people of Davangere and the object was not to punish the people.

He said that it was not his intention to enter into the details of the disturbances as every one knew it and he was sure that every one in the House would admit that the disturbances assumed serious proportions. One morning, 30 to 40 shops were broken into, their contents were thrown into the public road and set fire to in the broad open day light. A big mob threatened the police and the Taluk Office and the situation was rather anxious till re-inforcements came from other places. Attempts were made by the Government to bring about better relations between the communities, but the result was not satisfactory, and strained feelings continued to exist between the communities.

Merely because the Government had been maintaining a strong force there, there had been no occasion for any outburst and conflict. If, on the contrary, the Government had not taken the precautionary measure of maintaining additional police and there was a breach of peace in consequence, the Government would have been accused of not taking adequate precautionary measures to avert the trouble. Even now, if the police force was removed, he did not think that public peace would continue to be maintained. Davangere was a great commercial town and it was very easy to cause serious loss of property there as there were many cotton gins. He thought that in such a commercial place, it was absolutely necessary to guard the people aginst rowdyism.

Continuing he said that the Government quite agreed with the views expressed by Messrs. Chennabasappa and Linge Gowda that as soon as the people gave the assurance that there would be no fear of any disturbances, the additional police force would be withdrawn.

In respect of the views expressed by some of the previous speakers that the imposition of the penal tax on the people cast a slur on the State, the Second Member of Council remarked that it was in no way a disgrace. He was of opinion that it was a disgrace to allow such disturbances to take place and the remedies taken to put a stop to such disturbances, however strong they might be, could in no way be considered to be disgraceful.

He repeated that the moment all the communities joined together and gave an assurance in regard to the maintenance of public peace the additional police would be removed, and that the Government did not want to make any money by the imposition of the tax.

MR. N. Y. PISSAY enquired whether the people themselves asked for additional police there.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that it was not necessary for the people to ask at all. Government had information that people needed additional protection.

In the course of the discussion, it was stated that this was the first occasion when this section in the Police Regulation was put in force. As a matter of fact, he admitted that such occasions were very rare. But, then, it could not be said that this was the very first occasion on which such action was taken by Government. About 20 or 30 years back, a similar occasion did arise in Mysore. Although he regretted that such an untoward event should have happened even after the lapse of about 30 years, yet,

he felt that the State was fortunate in that no disturbances happened in that long interval. He added that the intention of Government was not to establish additional police force longer than was necessary and that the whole thing depended upon the people themselves.

With reference to the question asked by one of the members as to why such additional police force was not stationed at Bangalore during the last disturbance there, he said that wherever there was a necessity for additional police protection in the interests of public peace, Government would always give such protection.

With reference to the request of Mr. Channappa that the reports received from the District Magistrate and the Inspector-General of Police should be published, the Second Member of Council said that it could not be done and that it was enough to say that Government had ample reason to believe that additional police protection was necessary at Davangere.

MR. B. ABDUR RAHMON who spoke next said that for some time past the Mysore State was like a luminous star shining in the firmament and attracted the attention of the world. Unfortunately, by reason of the recent disturbances, the name of Mysore suffered to some extent. The disturbance at Davangere was not the first of its kind, as was stated, but was the second. The Government ought to have considered what the conditions of the people that suffered were, before enforcing the provisions of the section of the Police Regulation. The Muhammadans had suffered much. Their shops were burnt, their properties were looted and many families were rendered homeless; they were deprived of the means to earn their livelihood and even rich men were literally turned into beggars. Their mosques were destroyed. And yet some members said that the Muhammadans and the Hindus were living in concord after the Dewan's visit. But, as a matter of fact, when the Dewan went to Davangere, although he saw the real condition of the Muhammadans, yet, very little was done by Government to help them. Mr. Abdur Rahmon asked whether Government re-imbursed the sufferers for enormous losses sustained by them. It was the duty of Government to see who were adversely affected by the disturbance. By the imposition of the punitive tax, the Government taxed both the sufferers and the aggressors. He did not think that there was any justice in that.

Then, after the Second Member of Council went to the

place and made personal enquiries into the conditions of the Muhammadans, it was not right that they should have been called upon to pay for the additional police force. It was the business of Government to punish the rowdies only and not all the people. He did not think that Government helped the Muhammadan population in any way. While such was the case, it was wrong to have taxed the Muhammadans also. In his opinion, not until the rowdies were brought to book would real public peace be restored at Davangere.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that it was not possible to say who were the real offenders. The cases were going on in the courts and if it was found that the Muhammadans were free from any blame then the question would be considered.

In regard to mosques stated to have been burnt, he said Government had offered help to reconstruct them. But, the local Muhammadans said that they would themselves reconstruct them without any help from Government. He assured the member that if the Muhammadans should again come forward and ask for help the request would certainly be considered.

In regard to the destruction of shops, etc., referred to by Mr. Abdur Rahmon, the Second Member of Council said that it was impossible for Government to re-imburse the sufferers for their losses.

Mr. ABDUR RAHMON then enquired in what way special protection had been given to the Muhammadans to justify the imposition of the punitive tax.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that that question did not arise so far as past events were concerned and added that all that he could say was that Government would see that no such untoward event took place in the future.

MR. B. NARASINGA RAO also did not agree with the Government in regard to the need for the enforcement of the punitive tax. On this point many members had previously spoken and even the Second Member of Council who had visited the place had spoken about it in the course of his speech at the recent session of the Legislative Council. But the explanation now offered by the Second Member of Council justifying the imposition of the additional tax was, he said, not quite convincing to him. He expressed his regret at the severe losses sustained by the Muhammadans and at their present deplorable situation so

graphically described by Mr. B. Abdur Rahmon. He did not doubt that others would not join with him in his sentiments. He further said that Government appointed the Revenue Commissioner to investigate into the matter of the disturbance; but the Second Member of Council did not say what the result of such investigation was.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that that enquiry had nothing to do with the present question.

MR. B. NARASINGA RAO enquired whether, in that case, the present action of Government was arbitrary. If it was so, it would be tantamount to the saying "closing the stables after the horses have bolted away." There was no doubt that the Government had power to impose a punitive tax. But that power, he thought, should be exercised by Government sparingly. If any one had a giant's strength, it did not mean that he should use it like a giant.

Referring to the Second Member's statement that a similar action was taken during the Ganjam riots, Mr. B. Narasinga Rao said that that was more than 30 years ago and was the result of hundreds of people going to rescue the prisoners. He did not think that there was any comparison between that incident and the present disturbance at Davangere.

In regard to the statement that a number of shops were burnt, he asked who were responsible for such a state of things, and whether the officers on the spot could not have got help from Chitaldrug in less than two hours. This, he said, the officers did not do.

He did not agree with the Second Member's view that the additional police at Davangere could not be called a punitive police. The place contained very rich and respectable people and also *budmashes*. It was said that the tax would be levied only for one or two years. He asked whether it was not a slur on the law-abiding people of Mysore to ask them to pay such a tax. He was of opinion that the tax so far imposed was sufficient and that it should be abolished forthwith. He felt that if the local officers had followed the example of the Dewan in the sympathetic attitude displayed by him at Davangere during his first visit, there should have been no necessity for the imposition of the tax at all. His considered view was that the responsibility for the whole affair lay on the officers of Government and as such there was absolutely no reason to impose any punitive tax on the people.

While appreciating the vehemence with which the

motion was brought forward by the mover, MR. S. VENKATESAIYA said that the only point for consideration was whether the dangerous situation still continued. If it continued, then the necessity for the additional police force was justifiable. It was said that after the Dewan went to Davangere immediately after the disturbance, he established peace among the people and that there was no apprehension of any danger thereafter. But, Mr. Venkatesiah asked, if there was no such fear of further disturbance, whether the Dewan who pacified the people could also have been a party to the passing of the present orders under reference. Mr. Venkatesaiya did not think that calmness had been completely restored in Davangere. For instance he did not think that the people who had left the place returned yet. Some time after the occurrence of the first disturbance, it was generally stated and even Mr. Chandrasekhariah in the Legislative Council stated that there were no signs of further disturbance at Davangere. But, as a matter of fact, about a year later, there was a worse disturbance there. He therefore thought that it was necessary to go into the root of the matter and see whether there was anything really wrong there.

With reference to Mr. Abdur Rahmon's plea that the Muhammadans were not at fault and that it was wrong to impose punitive tax on them, Mr. Venkatesaiya asked whether they did not share in the general protection given by Government. If they did, then they had to pay. It was a recognised principle based on a high authority that people who shared in the police protection should pay for such protection. He was of opinion that while so much loss of property had taken place during the disturbance, it was unwise to lull one-self into thinking that there would be no further disturbances and no further action was needed. In his opinion, the action taken by Government was justified.

MR. VENKATAVARADA IYENGAR who next spoke agreed with the views expressed by Mr. S. Venkatesiah. He said that the disturbance at Davangere was due to want of co-operation on the part of the people there and that the seed of discontent had been sown by the religious dissensions at the time of Ganesha festival.

Many members replied that that was not so.

MR. VENKATAVARADA IYENGAR continuing said that he was firmly of opinion that the disturbances were due to communal feelings raging high at that place, and that until such feelings subsided there was the necessity for additional police protection.

With reference to the statement made that there was no instance of punitive tax imposed on the people, he said that he himself had known of two instances at least in recent years during his service and that Government had a perfect right to levy such a tax if the occasion demanded it. The only thing that the Government could have done was to consult the local people beforehand.

At this stage Mr. K. T. BHASHYAM IYENGAZ moved for closure.

THE DEWAN, however, ruled that the discussion might go on.

Referring to the statement made by the mover of the motion that there was no longer any necessity for continuing the punitive police, MR. H. C. DASAPPA said that the same question was brought before the Subjects Committee of the recent Non-Brahmin Conference in the course of which it was resolved that if an assurance was given by the local people, consisting of all communities, the police should be withdrawn forthwith. He thought that if the leaders of the Muhammadans and of the Hindus would come forward and give the necessary assurance, then Government should withdraw the police, in which case, the proposition now before the House would be withdrawn. He added that there was no use of a mere lip assurance. It should come as a result of the real unanimity among the leaders. If such a thing was done, then he felt sure that the people in the other parts of the country would also help in bringing about permanent peace.

He thought that before going further, it was necessary that the Muhammadan sufferers who lost so much of their property in the disturbance should be helped irrespective of the offences committed by them. He went further and said that to whatever community the sufferers belonged they should be helped.

Referring to Mr. Hosakoppa Krishna Rao's statement that the imposition of the punitive tax was tantamount to casting a slur on the State, Mr. H. C. Dasappa asked whether it was not the contributors of articles to the outside press expressing unwarranted and untrue statements against the Government and the administration that were really casting a slur.

MR. B. LINGE GOWDA agreed in the main with Mr. H. C. Dasappa and said that there was still suspicion in the minds of the people in regard to the state of affairs at Davangere. He, therefore, thought that police protection

was quite necessary. If, on the other hand, the Hindus and the Muhammadans gave the necessary assurance about the maintenance of public peace hereafter, Government should withdraw the additional police force immediately. He hoped that the leaders of the Muhammadans and the Hindus would give such an assurance.

MR. P. SUBBARAMA CHETTY next observed that the public did not know what the result of the enquiry by the Special Officer was. When the cases were before the Court, the appointment of the Special Officer and the levy of the punitive tax, he thought, were tantamount to pre-judging the judicial findings. Mr. Subbarama Chetty observed that if the report had been published, it could have been possible for the people to know whether the imposition of the tax was really necessary or not.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that the investigation by the Special Officer had nothing to do with the cases in the courts.

MR. MAHOMED ABBAS KHAN said that although it was now four months since the disturbance occurred, in the course of which more than 40 shops were looted, the Government did not render any help to the sufferers. He therefore requested Government to take up that question into serious consideration forthwith. He also said that if the leaders of the Muhammadan and the Hindu population gave the necessary assurance in regard to the maintenance of public peace at Davangere, Government should remove the additional police force.

MESSRS. NILIGIRI G. SANJEEVIAH and MAHOMED SAIT urged that the losses sustained by both the Hindus and the Muhammadans should be re-imbursed to them.

MR. RAMA DOSS opposed the motion and said that from his personal experience he could state that there was no peace at all at Davangere. He thought that the police force now stationed at Davangere was not only not enough but that it should be increased.

As it was 6-30 p.m. by then, discussion on the adjournment motion automatically closed.

The Assembly then rose for the day to meet again at 12 noon the next day.

THIRD DAY—*Wednesday, 16th October 1929.*

The House re-assembled at 12 noon.

In the absence of the Dewan, the First Member of Council presided.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

MR. B. SRINIVASA RAO (Bowringpet Taluk).—

Q.—24. Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) When the District Board, Kolar, decided the levy of Railway Cess and the resolution passed by the Board in this respect ?

(*b*) The agreement between the Board and the Government in regard to this levy ?

(*c*) The year-war realisations from the levy from the beginning up-to-date and the amount and the manner in which it was spent every year ?

(*d*) The year-war amount spent by the District Board towards the railway up till now ?

(*e*) The extent of the railway debenture bonds raised by the Board, the amount liquidated so far and the balance due towards principal and interest ?

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, GENERAL DEPARTMENTS.—

A.—24. (*a*) On 16th November 1912. The resolution of the Board is as follows :—

"Resolved that Government be addressed to allow a three-pie railway cess to be levied in the District on Land Revenue and Mohatarfa so as to make provision for the formation of a sinking fund to pay off the loan capital and payment of interest on the Debenture Bonds."

(*b*) As the levy is under the Regulation, there is no agreement in regard to the levy of the Railway Cess. If the member refers to the agreement relating to construction of railway, then it is to be stated that under Clause 9A of that agreement the District Board should repay the amounts